arXiv:1701.04191v1 [math.CO] 16 Jan 2017

Stars versus stripes Ramsey numbers

G.R. Omidi,[a,c] G. Raeisi,[b,c] Z. Rahimi[a]

[a]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Isfahan University of Technology, Isfahan, 84156-83111, Iran

[b]Department of Mathematical Sciences, Shahrekord University, Shahrekord, P.O.Box 115, Iran

[c]School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM),

P.O.Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran

romidi@cc.iut.ac.ir, g.raeisi@math.iut.ac.ir, zahra.rahimi@math.iut.ac.ir

Abstract

For given simple graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_t$, the Ramsey number $R(G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_t)$ is the smallest positive integer n such that if the edges of the complete graph K_n are partitioned into t disjoint color classes giving t graphs $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_t$, then at least one H_i has a subgraph isomorphic to G_i. In this paper, for positive integers $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ and $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c$ the Ramsey number $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$ is computed, where nK_2 denotes a matching (stripe) of size n, i.e., n pairwise disjoint edges and S_n is a star with n edges. This result generalizes and strengthens significantly a well-known result of Cockayne and Lorimer and also a known result of Gyárfás and Sárközy.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we only concerned with undirected simple finite graphs and we follow [1] for terminology and notations not defined here. For a graph G, we denote its vertex set, edge set, minimum degree, maximum degree and complement graph by $V(G)$, $E(G)$, $\delta(G)$, $\Delta(G)$ and $\bar{G}$, respectively. If $v \in V(G)$, we use $\deg_G(v)$ and $N_G(v)$ (or simply $\deg(v)$ and $N(v)$) to denote the degree and the neighbors of v in G, respectively. Also, we use nK_2 to denote a matching (stripe) of size n, i.e., n pairwise disjoint edges and as usual, a complete graph on n vertices, a star with n edges and a balanced complete bipartite graph on $2n$ vertices are denoted by K_n, S_n and $K_{n,n}$, respectively. In addition, for disjoint subsets A and B of the vertex set of a graph G, we use $[A, B]$ to denote the bipartite subgraph of G with partite sets A and B.

If G is a graph whose edges are colored by c colors, we use G^i, $1 \leq i \leq c$, to denote the subgraph of G induced by the edges of the i-th color. Moreover, for a vertex v of G, we use $\deg^i(v)$ and $N^i(v)$ to denote the degree and the neighbors of v in G^i, respectively.

Recall that an edge coloring of G is called *proper* if adjacent edges are assigned different colors. The minimum number of colors for a proper edge coloring of G is called the *chromatic index* of G and is denoted by $\chi'(G)$. It is well known that for a bipartite graph G, we have $\chi'(G) = \Delta(G)$, see [1].

Let $G, G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c$ be given simple graphs. We write $G \to (G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c)$, if the edges of G are partitioned into c disjoint color classes giving c graphs $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_c$, then at least one H_i has a subgraph isomorphic to G_i. For given simple graphs $G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c$, the *multicolor Ramsey number* $R(G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c)$ is defined as the smallest positive integer n such that $K_n \to (G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c)$. The existence of such a positive integer is guaranteed by the Ramsey's classical result [8]. For a survey on Ramsey theory, we refer the reader to the regularly updated survey by Radziszowski [7].

There is very little known about $R(G_1, G_2, \ldots, G_c)$ for $c \geq 3$, even for very special graphs. In this paper, we consider the case that G_i's are stars or stripes. The Ramsey number of stars or stripes were investigated by several authors. The Ramsey number of stars is determined by Burr and Roberts [2] and the Ramsey number for stripes was determined by Cockayne and Lorimer [3]. In fact they showed that $R(n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_c) = n_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1$ for $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$. In [6] Gyárfás and Sárközy determined the exact value of the Ramsey number of a star versus two stripes and then they used this result to give a positive answer to a conjecture of Schelp in an asymptotic sense. It is also worth noting that the Ramsey number for many stars and one stripe was determined in [4] as follows.

Theorem 1.1. [4] *Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ be positive integers, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(t_i - 1)$ and $n \geq 1$. Then*

1) $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, nK_2) = 2n$, if $\Sigma < n$,

2) $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, nK_2) = \Sigma + n$, if $\Sigma \geq n$, Σ is even and some t_i is even,

3) $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, nK_2) = \Sigma + n + 1$, otherwise.

Note that, using Theorem 1.1 for $n = 1$, we conclude that $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}) = \Sigma + 1$, if Σ and at least one t_i are even and $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}) = \Sigma + 2$, otherwise.

The aim of this paper is the following theorem which provides the exact value of the Ramsey number of any number of stars versus any number of stripes. This theorem extends known results on the Ramsey number of stars and stripes in the literature.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ and $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c$ be positive integers, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(t_i - 1)$ and $r = R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$. If $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$, then*

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) = \max\{r + \delta, n_1\} + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1,$$

where $\delta = 0$ if $\Sigma < \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even, and $\delta = -1$, otherwise.

As an easy corollary of Theorem 1.2, we have the following result which generalizes a known result of Gyárfás and Sárközy [6] on the Ramsey number of one star versus two stripes.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $t \geq 1$ and $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$ be positive integers. Then*

$$R(S_t, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) = \max\{t, n_1\} + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1.$$

By Corollary 1.3, for $t \leq n_1$, $n_1 = \max\{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c\}$, we have

$$R(S_t, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) = R(n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) = n_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1,$$

which strengthens significantly a well-known result of Cockayne and Lorimer on the Ramsey number of stripes. In the other word, if G is a graph obtained by deleting the edges of a graph with maximum degree $(n_1 - 1)$ from a complete graph on $R(n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$ vertices, then

$$G \to (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2).$$

In addition, we obtain the following interesting result if we investigate to Corollary 1.3, when $t \geq n_1$.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$ be arbitrary positive integers, and let G be a graph on $n \geq n_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1$ vertices such that $\delta(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1$. Then*

$$G \to (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2).$$

Proof. Set $t = n - \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) - 1$. Clearly $t \geq n_1$ and so by Corollary 1.3, we have

$$R(S_t, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) = n.$$

Since G has n vertices and $\delta(G) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1) + 1$, we have $\Delta(\bar{G}) \leq t - 1$, which means that $\bar{G}$ is a S_t-free graph and so the assertion holds by the above equation. ■

It is also worth noting that the condition on the minimum degree in Corollary 1.4 is best possible. Indeed, let G be a graph on $n \geq R(n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$ vertices whose vertex set is partitioned into disjoint sets A, B with $|A| = \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1)$, $|B| = n - \Lambda$ and let $E(G) = \{uv | \{u, v\} \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$. Now, set $V_0 = B$ and consider a partition of vertices of A into sets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_c$ of sizes $n_1 - 1$, $n_2 - 1$, $\ldots$, $n_c - 1$, respectively. For each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$ color with the i-th color all edges within V_i or edges with one vertex in V_i and one in V_j, where $j < i$. In this coloring, the largest monochromatic matching of color i has $n_i - 1$ edges, while the minimum degree of G is Λ.

2 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In order to prove Theorem 1.2, we need some lemmas. First, we start with the following simple but useful lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ be positive integers, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(t_i - 1)$ and let H be a graph with $\chi'(H) \leq \Sigma$. Then $E(H)$ can be decomposed into edge-disjoint subgraphs $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_s$ such that $\Delta(H_i) \leq t_i - 1$.*

Proof. Consider a proper edge-coloring of H with $\chi'(H)$ colors. Partition the set of colors into s sets $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_s$ of sizes at most $t_1-1, t_2-1, \ldots, t_s-1$, respectively. Let H_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, be the subgraph of H induced by the edges of colors in A_i. Clearly H_i's are the desired subgraphs which decompose $E(H)$. ■

An *alternating cycle* in an edge colored graph is a cycle which is properly colored i.e. no two consecutive edges in the cycle have the same color. We say that a vertex v in an edge colored graph G *separates colors* if no component of $G - v$ is joined to v by at least two edges of different colors. Grossman and Häggkvist gave a sufficient condition under which a two-edge colored graph must have an alternating cycle. In [5] Grossman and Häggkvist proved that if G is a graph whose edges are colored red and blue and there is no alternating cycle in G, then G contains a vertex v that separates the colors. Bang-Jensen and G. Gutin asked whether Grossman and Häggkvist's result could be extended to edge-colored graphs in general, where there is no constraint on the number of colors. In [9] Yeo gave an affirmative answer to this question as follows.

Theorem 2.2. ([9]) If G is a c-edge-colored graph, $c \geq 2$, with no alternating cycle, then there is a vertex $v \in V(G)$ such that no connected component of $G - v$ is joined to v with edges of more than one color, i.e G contains a vertex separating colors.

Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ be positive integers, $\Sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{s}(t_i - 1)$ and $r = R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$. Also let $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$ be positive integers and $\Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - 1)$. Set

$$f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c) = \begin{cases} \max\{r, n_1\} + \Lambda + 1 & \Sigma \text{ and at least one } t_i \text{ is even and} \\ & \Sigma < \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}, \\ \max\{r-1, n_1\} + \Lambda + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In fact, $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c)$ is the number that we claimed is equal to the Ramsey number $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$ in Theorem 1.2. Using these notations, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ and $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c$ with $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq \cdots \geq n_c$ be positive integers and let G be a graph on $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c)$ vertices such that $\bar{G} \nrightarrow (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$. Then*

$$G \to (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2).$$

Proof. Assume that the statement of this lemma is not correct and suppose that a counterexample exists. Therefore, there are some positive integers $t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s$ and $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c$ with $n_1 = \max\{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c\}$, and a graph G on $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c)$ vertices, such that $\bar{G} \nrightarrow (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$ and $G \nrightarrow (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$. Note that $c \geq 2$, by Theorem 1.1.

Among all counterexamples let G be a minimal one having the maximum possible number of edges, i.e. G is a graph satisfies the following conditions:

(a) The number of vertices of G, $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c)$, is as small as possible.

(b) Among all counterexamples satisfying (a), G is a counterexample with minimum c, i.e. no counterexample is colored with less than c colors.

(c) Among all counterexamples satisfying (a) and (b), G is one having the maximum possible number of edges.

The fact $G \nrightarrow (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$ implies that the edges of G can be colored by colors $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_c$ so that for each i, $1 \leq i \leq c$, the induced graph on edges of color β_i does not contain a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2. Let G^i be the subgraph of G induced by the edges of color β_i. As $|V(G)| \geq R(n_1k_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$, we deduce that G is not a complete graph. Let u, v be non-adjacent vertices in G. As G satisfies (a), (b) and (c), $n_iK_2 \subseteq G^i + uv$ (to see this, it only suffices to add the edge uv to G and color uv by β_i and then use the property (c) of G) which means that $(n_i - 1)K_2 \subseteq G^i$. Let M be the matching of size $(n_i - 1)$ in G^i. Since $n_iK_2 \nsubseteq G^i$, we must have $N^i(u), N^i(v) \subseteq V(M)$. Moreover, the fact $n_iK_2 \nsubseteq G^i$ implies that for each edge $xy \in M$, the number of edges of color i between $\{x, y\}$ and $\{u, v\}$ is at most 2. Thus $\deg^i(u) + \deg^i(v) \leq 2(n_i - 1)$, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$. Therefore,

$$\deg_G(u) + \deg_G(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{c} (\deg^i(u) + \deg^i(v)) \leq 2\Lambda. \tag{1}$$

Since $\bar{G} \nrightarrow (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$, there is a s coloring of edges of $\bar{G}$ such that the graph induced by the i-th color does not contain S_{t_i} as a subgraph. Thus, for every vertex $v \in V(G)$, we have $\deg_{\bar{G}}(v) \leq \Sigma$. (Indeed, if v is a vertex with $\deg_{\bar{G}}(v) \geq \Sigma + 1$, then the Pigeonhole principle implies that any s coloring of the edges of $\bar{G}$ contains a monochromatic S_{t_i} of i-th color with center v, for some i, a contradiction). Therefore, $\delta(G) \geq f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c) - \Sigma - 1$. An easy calculation shows that $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda + 1$ unless $\Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even and in this case, we have $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda$. If $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda + 1$, then for every pair of vertices u, v, $\deg_G(u) + \deg_G(v) \geq 2(\Lambda + 1)$. Using (1), we deduce that a counterexample could not exist unless $\Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even. Therefore, hereafter we may suppose that Σ and at least one t_i is even and $\Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$. Note that, in this case we have $f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c) = \Sigma + \Lambda + 1$. By (1) and the fact $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda$ we conclude that for every pair of non-adjacent vertices u, v in G:

$$\deg(u) = \deg(v) = \Lambda, \tag{2}$$

$$\deg^i(u) + \deg^i(v) = 2(n_i - 1),\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, c \tag{3}$$

Claim 1. $\Sigma \leq \Lambda$.

Proof of Claim 1. On the contrary, let $\Sigma \geq \Lambda + 1$. It is easy to see that

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) \leq R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, (\Lambda+1)K_2).$$

As Σ and some t_i are even, by Theorem 1.1 we have

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, (\Lambda+1)K_2) = \Sigma + \Lambda + 1,$$

which implies that

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) \leq \Sigma + \Lambda + 1.$$

This means that $K_N \to (S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$, where $N = \Sigma + \Lambda + 1$. Therefore $\bar{G} \to (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$ or $G \to (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$, a contradiction. □

Claim 2. G is a 2-connected graph.

Proof of Claim 2. By Claim 1, one can easily check that $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda \geq \frac{|V(G)|}{2}$, unless $\Sigma = \Lambda$. Therefore, by the Dirac's Theorem [1], G is a hamiltonian graph and so a 2-connected graph unless $\Sigma = \Lambda$. Now, assume that $\Sigma = \Lambda$. In this case, $|V(G)| = 2\Lambda + 1$ and $\delta(G) \geq \Lambda$. Clearly, G is connected (in fact the diameter of G is two, since every two non-adjacent vertices have a common neighbor). If there is a cut vertex v of G, then $G - v$ has exactly two components G_1, G_2 with

$$G[V(G_1) \cup \{v\}] = G[V(G_2) \cup \{v\}] = K_{\Lambda+1}.$$

Now, we claim that all edges of $G_1 \cup \{v\}$ (also $G_2 \cup \{v\}$) have the same color. To see this, let v_1 be an arbitrary vertex of G_1 and let the edge vv_1 is colored by β_i, for some i, $1 \leq i \leq c$. Since $G_1 \cup \{v\}$ is a complete graph and v_1 is an arbitrary vertex of G_1, in order to show that all edges of $G_1 \cup \{v\}$ have the same color, it only suffices to show that all edges of $G_1 \cup \{v\}$ incident to v_1 are of color β_i. On the contrary, assume that the edge v_1v_2 of $G_1 \cup \{v\}$ is of color β_j, where $j \neq i$. Now let M_1, M_2 be arbitrary perfect matchings in G_1, G_2, respectively, where $v_1v_2 \in M_1$. Therefore, $|M_1 \cup M_2| = \Lambda$ and we may assume that for each $t = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, the matching $M_1 \cup M_2$ contains exactly $n_t - 1$ edges of color β_t, since otherwise for some $1 \leq i \leq c$, G has a monochromatic matching of size n_i with color β_i, which is impossible. Set $M = (M_1 \setminus \{v_1v_2\}) \cup M_2 \cup \{vv_1\}$. Clearly M contains a monochromatic matching of size n_i with color β_i, which is again impossible. By a similar argument, all edges of $G_2 \cup \{v\}$ have the same color. Therefore at most two colors are appeared on the edges of G, say β_i and β_j (for some i and j). Without any loss of generality, we may assume that all edges within G_2 are of color β_j and $j \neq 1$. As $\Lambda = \Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$ and $|V(G_2)| = \Lambda$, we obtain that $|V(G_2)| \geq 2n_2 \geq 2n_j$ which means that G_2 contains a subgraph isomorphic to n_jK_2 of color β_j, a contradiction. □

Now the analysis depends on the study of certain cycles in G. These are alternating cycles, colored with some colors $\beta \in \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_c\}$, having no two adjacent edges of the same color. The rest of the proof is devoted to prove that an alternating cycle exists in G.

Claim 3. G has an alternating cycle.

Proof of Claim 3. On the contrary, assume that G does not have an alternating cycle. Thus using Theorem 2.2, G has a vertex v separating colors. Since G is 2-connected by Claim 2, all edges of G incident to v have the same color, say β_i. Set $G' = G \setminus \{v\}$. Note that

$$|G'| = f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_c) = \Sigma + \Lambda' + 1,$$

where $\Lambda' = \Lambda - 1$, and $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_c$ are the numbers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_i - 1, \ldots, n_c$ in the decreasing order. Clearly any s-coloring of the edges of $\bar{G}$ induces an s-coloring of the edges of $\bar{G'}$. Therefore $\bar{G'} \nrightarrow (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$. From the minimality of G we deduce that G' has a subgraph M isomorphic to $(n_i - 1)K_2$ whose edges are colored by β_i. If the degree of v as a separator vertex is at least $2n_i - 1$, then there is a vertex $u \in N_G(v)$ which is unsaturated by the vertices of the matching M. Thus adding the edge uv to the matching M yields a monochromatic copy of n_iK_2 with color β_i in G, which is impossible. Therefore, the proof of the claim will be completed if we prove that the degree of v as a separator vertex is at least $2n_i - 1$.

First let all edges of G incident to v have color β_i and $i \geq 2$. Since $\Lambda \geq \Sigma$ by Claim 1, and also $\deg_G(v) \geq \delta(G) \geq \Lambda$, we obtain that $\deg_G(v) \geq \Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\} \geq 2n_2 \geq 2n_i$ and we are done.

Now, let all edges of G incident to v have color β_1. Let $\deg_G(v) = 2n_1 - k$, for some $k \geq 2$. Note that the fact $\Sigma \geq \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$ implies that $|V(G)| = \Sigma + \Lambda + 1 > 2n_1$ and so v is not adjacent to all vertices of G. Therefore, by (2) we obtain that $\deg_G(v) = 2n_1 - k = \Lambda$. This means that

$$n_1 = \sum_{i=2}^{c}(n_i - 1) + k - 1. \tag{4}$$

Since $\deg_G(v) = \Lambda$ and $|V(G)| = \Sigma + \Lambda + 1$, the vertex v has exactly Σ non-neighbors in G. Let S be the set of non-neighbors of v in G. By (3), for every vertex $z \in S$, $\deg^1(z) = k-2$ and for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, c$ we have $\deg^i(z) = 2n_i - 2$. Since for every vertex $z \in S$, $\deg^2(z) = 2n_2 - 2$, Equation (3) implies that the graph induced by the vertices of S is a complete graph. Now, we prove that $G[S]$ contains an alternating cycle. By Theorem 2.2, $G[S]$ contains an alternating cycle unless there is a vertex which separates colors. Let z be a vertex of $G[S]$ separating colors and all edges of $G[S]$ incident to v have the same color, say β_i. If $i = 1$ then $k - 2 \geq \deg^1_{G[S]}(z) \geq \Sigma - 1$ which implies that $k - 1 \geq \Sigma \geq n_1$, which contradicts (4). If $i \geq 2$ then $2n_i - 2 \geq \deg^i_{G[S]}(z) \geq \Sigma - 1$ which implies that $2n_i - 1 \geq \Sigma \geq 2n_2 \geq 2n_i$, a contradiction. This contradiction shows that if v is a vertex of G separating colors and all edges of G incident to v have the same color β_i, then the degree of v as a separator vertex is at least $2n_i - 1$, which completes the proof of the Claim 3. □

Now let C be an alternating cycle of G which has l_i edges colored by β_i, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, then it has $\sum_{i=1}^{c} l_i$ vertices. For each i, the l_i edges of C colored by β_i form a subgraph isomorphic to l_iK_2. If $G' = V(G) \setminus V(C)$, then the number of vertices in G' is

$$f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_c) = \Sigma + \sum_{i=1}^{c}(n_i - l_i - 1) + 1,$$

where $m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_c$ are the numbers $n_i - l_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, c$ in the decreasing order. As $n_1 \geq m_1 = \max\{m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_c\}$ and C is a subgraph of G which is properly colored, from the minimality of G we deduce that G' has a monochromatic subgraph isomorphic to $(n_i - l_i)K_2$ whose edges are colored by β_i, for some $1 \leq i \leq c$. Combining this with a monochromatic subgraph l_iK_2 of color β_i in C, we obtain a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2 with color β_i in G, a contradiction. This contradiction shows that this lemma is true and so the proof is completed.

■

Now, we are ready to give a proof for Theorem 1.2 which provides the exact value of the Ramsey number $R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. To see that the Ramsey number can not be less than the claimed number, first consider the case that $\Sigma < \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even. Since Σ and some t_i are even, $r = \Sigma + 1$ by Theorem 1.1. If $\Sigma < n_1$, then consider a partition of $n_1 + \Lambda$ vertices into sets $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_c$ of sizes $2n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \ldots, n_c - 1$ respectively. Color with the first color all edges which are incident with two vertices of V_1 and for each $i = 2, \ldots, c$ color with the i-th color all edges having two vertices in V_i or one vertex in V_i and one in V_j where $j < i$. Clearly, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, the graph induced by the edges of the i-th color does not contain a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2.

If $n_1 \leq \Sigma < 2n_2$, then partition $\Sigma + \Lambda + 1$ vertices into sets $V_1 = A \cup B$, $V_2 = C \cup D$, $V_3, \ldots, V_c$ with $|A| = |B| = \Sigma$, $|C| = 2n_2 - \Sigma - 1$, $|D| = n_1 - n_2$ and $|V_i| = n_i - 1$, $3 \leq i \leq c$. Color all edges contained in B, D and edges in $[B, C], [D, C], [B, D], [A, D]$ by the first color β_1, all edges contained in A, C and edges in $[A, C]$ by β_2. For each $i = 3, 4, \ldots, c$, color with β_i all edges having two vertices in V_i or one vertex in V_i and one in V_j where $j < i$. Clearly, for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, the graph induced by the edges of color β_i does not contain a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2. The remaining uncolored edges are $[A, B]$ which form a copy of $K_{\Sigma,\Sigma}$. By Lemma 2.1, the edges of $K_{\Sigma,\Sigma}$ can be colored by s-colors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_s$ such that the induced graph on edges of color α_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, does not contain S_{t_i} as a subgraph. This yields an edge coloring of the complete graph on $\max\{r, n_1\} + \Lambda$ vertices with $s + c$ colors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_s$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_c$ such that the induced graph on edges of color α_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, does not contain S_{t_i} as a subgraph and for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, the induced graph on edges of color β_i does not contain a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2. This observation shows that if $\Sigma < \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even, then

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2}, \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) \geq \max\{r, n_1\} + \Lambda + 1.$$

Now assume that the case "$\Sigma < \max\{n_1, 2n_2\}$, Σ is even and some t_i is even" does not occur. Consider a partition of $n = \max\{r - 1, n_1\} + \Lambda$ vertices into sets $V_0, V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_c$ of sizes $\max\{r - 1, n_1\}, n_1 - 1, n_2 - 1, \ldots, n_c - 1$ respectively. For each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, c$, color with β_i all edges within V_i or edges with one vertex in V_i and one in V_j, where $j < i$. Now, if $r - 1 \leq n_1$, then $|V_0| = n_1$, and in this case color all edges within V_0 by β_1. In fact this is a c-edge coloring of $K_{n_1+\Lambda}$ that does not have a matching of size n_i of color β_i, $1 \leq i \leq c$. If $r - 1 > n_1$, then $|V_0| = r - 1$ and so there is an edge coloring of K_{r-1} with s colors $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s$ without a monochromatic copy of S_{t_i} of color α_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$. This yields an $(s + c)$-edge coloring of K_n that does not have a monochromatic star S_{t_i} with color α_i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, and no

monochromatic matching of size n_i in color β_i, $1 \leq i \leq c$. Therefore

$$R(S_{t_1}, S_{t_2} \ldots, S_{t_s}, n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2) \geq f(t_1, \ldots, t_s, n_1, \ldots, n_c).$$

To prove the other direction, consider a complete graph on $N = f(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_s, n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_c)$ vertices whose edges are arbitrarily colored by $s + c$ colors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_s$ and $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_c$. Let G be the graph induced by all edges of color $\beta_1, \beta_2, \ldots, \beta_c$ in K_N. If for each i, $1 \leq i \leq s$, the subgraph induced by the edges of color α_i in K_N does not contain a copy of S_{t_i}, then $\bar{G} \nrightarrow (S_{t_1}, S_{t_1}, \ldots, S_{t_s})$ and so Lemma 2.3 implies that $G \rightarrow (n_1K_2, n_2K_2, \ldots, n_cK_2)$. This means that for some i, $1 \leq i \leq c$, the subgraph of K_N induced on the edges of color β_i contains a subgraph isomorphic to n_iK_2, which completes the proof of the theorem. ■

Acknowledgment

The research of the first and second authors are partially carried out in the IPM-Isfahan Branch and in part supported respectively by grants No. 94050217 and No. 94050057, from IPM.

References

[1] J. A. Bondy, U. S. R. Murty, Graph Theory with Applications, American Elsevier Publishing Co. INC, 1976.

[2] S. A. Burr, J. A. Roberts, On Ramsey numbers for stars, *Util. Math.* 4 (1973), 217-220.

[3] E. J. Cockayne, P. J. Lorimer, The Ramsey number for stripes. *J. Austral. Math. Soc.* 19 (1975), 252-256.

[4] E. J. Cockayne, P. J. Lorimer, On Ramsey graph numbers for stars and stripes, *Canadian Math. Bull.* 18 (1975), 31-34.

[5] J. W. Grossman, R. Häggkvist, Alternating cycles in edge-partitioned graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 34 (1983), 77-81.

[6] A. Gyárfás, G. Sárközy, Star versus two stripes Ramsey numbers and a conjecture of Schelp, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* 21 (2012), 179–186.

[7] S. P. Radziszowski, Small Ramsey numbers, *Electron. J. Combin.* (2014), DS1.

[8] F. P. Ramsey, On a problem of formal logic, *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 30 (1930), 264-286.

[9] A. Yeo, A note on the alternating cycles in edge-colored graphs, *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B* 69 (1997), 222-225.